

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES BEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMUSSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bol 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/032,006 12/31/2001		12/31/2001	Richard Rodriguez-Val	06975-179001/ Commerce 04	6136	
26171	759	09/29/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022			AL HASHEMI, SANA A			
		, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2161		
				DATE MAILED: 09/29/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/032,006	RODRIGUEZ-VAL ET AL.	RODRIGUEZ-VAL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Sana Al-Hashemi	2161			

Potoro the Eiling of an Annual Priof								
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Sana Al-Hashemi	2161						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 19 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE TH	HE REPLY FILED 19 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for								
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		1: 4	(DTOL 204)					
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 		ompilani Amendmeni	(PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		timely filed emendm	ont conceling					
the non-allowable claim(s).	mowable if submitted in a separate	, urriery nieu arrienuir	ient canceing					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: 23-33, 35, and36. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. Other:								
		7						
	/ SA	FET METJAHIC						
	SUPERVISO	RY PATENT EXAMIN	ER					
LS Potent and Trademark Office	TECHNO	LOGY CENTER 2100						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant new arguments with respect to claim 23, are considered but did not place the case in condition for allowance.

Applicant argues that prior art applied fails to disclose "frequency of usage".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. at Col. 3, lines 31-53, the Bigger discloses frequency of usage by allowing the user to enter the user ID and Password that is a frequency usage.

Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose "frequency of usage threshold".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. At Col. 5, lines 56-64, and Col. 7, lines 12-23, Bigger discloses a method of threshold the frequency of usage. Since the Specification does not provides any specific support to the argued features, Examiner interpreted the frequency usage and frequency threshold in light of detailed desription.